AGENDA
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
SERVICE AUTHORITY FOR FREeways EMERGENCIES
AND
MONTEREY COUNTY REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE
JOINT POWERS AGENCY

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Members are: Jerry Edelen (Chair),
Jane Parker (1st Vice Chair), Kimbley Craig (2nd Vice Chair),
Simón Salinas (Past Chair),
Fernando Armenta (County representative), Alejandro Chavez (City representative)

Wednesday, January 8, 2014
TAMC Conference Room
55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas

***9:00 a.m.***

Complete agenda packets are on display at the Transportation Agency for Monterey County office and at these public libraries: Carmel, Monterey, Salinas Steinbeck Branch, Seaside, Prunedale, and King City. Any person who has a question concerning an item on this agenda may call the Agency Secretary to make inquiry concerning the nature of the item described on the agenda. Please recycle this agenda.

1. **ROLL CALL:** Call to order and self-introductions. If you are unable to attend, please contact Elouise Rodriguez, Senior Administrative Assistant. Your courtesy to the other members to assure a quorum is appreciated.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Any member of the public may address the Committee on any item not on the agenda but within the jurisdiction of Transportation Agency and Executive Committee. Comments on items on today's agenda may be given when that agenda item is discussed.
BEGINNING OF CONSENT AGENDA: Approve the staff recommendations for items 3.1-3.3 below by majority vote with one motion. Any member may pull an item off the Consent Agenda to be moved to the end of the CONSENT AGENDA for discussion and action.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td><strong>APPROVE</strong> enclosed minutes from the Executive Committee meeting of November 6, 2013. Pages 4 - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.2 | **RECEIVE** report on proposed federal bicycle and pedestrian legislation.
   – Watson Pages 8 - 13 |
| 3.3 | **RECEIVE** update on proposed statewide transportation ballot measure.
   – Watson Pages 14 - 16 |

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>APPROVE</strong> recommendations for the 12th Annual Transportation Excellence Awards. – Gavin Page 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>DISCUSS</strong> the basic concept for the 2013 Transportation Agency for Monterey County Annual Report. – Cook Page 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>RECEIVE</strong> update on the Regional Surface Transportation Program. – Zeller Pages 19 - 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>RECEIVE</strong> update on the Marina-Salinas Multimodal Corridor Conceptual Plan – Green Pages 22 - 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This project will plan for a multimodal corridor that will connect the Monterey Peninsula to Salinas. Transportation Agency staff will work with partner agencies and members of the public to develop the plan.*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>RECEIVE</strong> report on draft agenda for TAMC Board meeting of January 22, 2014. (Handout)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><strong>ADJOURN</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Executive Committee meeting is:
Wednesday, February 5, 2014
Please mark your calendars.

Documents relating to an item on the open session that are distributed to the Committee less than 72 hours prior to the meeting shall be available for public inspection at the office of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, 55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, CA. Documents distributed to the Committee at the meeting by staff will be available at the meeting; documents distributed to the Committee by members of the public shall be made available after the meeting.

Transportation Agency for Monterey County
55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, CA 93901-2902
Monday thru Friday
8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
TEL: 831-775-0903
FAX: 831-775-0897

If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Individuals requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, may contact Transportation Agency at 831-775-0903. Auxiliary aids or services include wheelchair accessible facilities, sign language interpreters, Spanish Language interpreters and printed materials, and printed materials in large print, Braille or on disk. These requests may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting, and should be made at least 72 hours before the meeting. All reasonable efforts will be made to accommodate the request.
DRAFT MINUTES

TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
SERVICE AUTHORITY FOR FREEWAYS EMERGENCIES AND MONTEREY
COUNTY REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE
JOINT POWERS AGENCY

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Members are: Jerry Edelen (Chair),
Jane Parker (1st Vice Chair), Kimbley Craig (2nd Vice Chair),
Simon Salinas (Past Chair),
Fernando Armenta (County representative), Alejandro Chavez (City representative)

Wednesday, November 6, 2013
*** 9:00 a.m. ***
Transportation Agency Conference Room
55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Edelen called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Board members present: Craig, Edelen, Parker, Salinas and alternate Martinez for Armenta. Staff present: Goel, Hale, Muck, Rodriguez, Watson and Zeller. Others present: Agency Counsel Reimann and Sam Teel, Monterey County Hospitality Association. Committee member Chavez arrived after approval of the consent agenda.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

3. **CONSENT AGENDA**
   On a motion by Board member Parker and seconded by Board member Craig, the committee voted 5 – 0 to approve the consent agenda.

   3.1 **APPROVED** minutes from the Executive Committee meeting of October 2, 2013.

   3.2 **RECOMMENDED** that the Transportation Agency for Monterey County Board **APPROVE** calendar year 2014 schedule of meetings for Agency Board of Directors and Executive Committee.

END OF CONSENT
4. **RECEIVED** update on response to draft Caltrans Incurred Cost Audit.

Executive Director Debbie Hale reported that the Caltrans incurred audits were performed to assure the Agency is following the rules when administering contracts. She reported that there was a variety of findings in the draft audit report and response letter was sent providing clarifications and information not adequately reflected in the report. To assure that all details are addressed, staff is looking at all of the Agency’s policies and will bring forward some updates. Counsel Reimann reported that the Agency's intent is always to follow the laws and regulations. Once the final Caltrans audit letter is received the findings will be presented to the Committee and the TAMC Board.

Board member Salinas reported that AMBAG had a similar audit and it took quite a long time to receive the final audit letter.

5. **PROVIDED** direction and guidance to staff on the assumptions for the three-year operating budget for fiscal years 14/15, 15/16, and 16/17.

Rita Goel, Director of Finance & Administration, reported on the assumptions for the three-year operating budget for fiscal years 14/15, 15/16, and 16/17. She reported that the Agency budget separates expenditures into two types: operating and direct program. Operating expenditures include staff salaries and benefits, materials and supplies, and equipment purchases. Direct program expenditures include outside consultants, contracts, expenditures that apply to specific work program tasks such as rail program, highway projects, bicycle and pedestrian program etc. She noted that although there were no firm numbers at this time, we have a basic idea where revenue might come from. There may be a decline in the overall planning funds. AMBAG has reduced payment from $300,000 in the past, to $65,000 expected in 14/15. PPM funds are also down. However, there may be some carryover of these funds. Ms. Goel noted that the Agency continues to have a reserve savings account, but may have to dip into it to cover any shortfall in funding. Ms. Goel reported that there may be a new expense for the potential sales tax measure under the direct program. She also noted due to funding issues, staff is recommending placing a hold on the legislative consultants in FY 14/15. In conclusion, Ms. Goel noted that the draft budget will go to the Board in February 2014, and again in May for adoption.
6. **RECEIVED** report on State Transportation Improvement Program of projects scenarios.

The committee received the report on State Transportation Improvement Program of projects scenarios.

Mike Zeller, Senior Transportation Planner, reviewed the list of projects recommended for the 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program.

Todd Muck, Deputy Executive Director, reported on the Imjin Road Widening project, he noted that Agency staff is working with the City of Marina and their consultant Kimley Horn as they continue to refine project cost estimates. Director Muck reported construction cost estimates are significantly more than the $8 million originally targeted. Staff is recommending $3.3 million be programmed for environmental and design phases of the project. Mr. Muck also noted that staff looked at the Highway 1 / Fremont Street project and has met with Tim O’Halloran of Seaside to discuss the issues brought up at the October Board meeting. There wasn’t a project component that fit into the amount of funding available in this cycle.

7. **APPOINTED** a Nominating Committee to meet and return to Board of Directors on January 22, 2014 with recommendations for Board Chair, 1st Vice Chair, 2nd Vice Chair, and Executive Committee to serve one-year terms beginning upon their election through the next election of officers at the beginning of the January 28, 2015 Board meeting.

On a motion by Board member Parker and seconded by Board member Craig, the committee voted 6 – 0 to appoint Board members Frank Sollecito and Simon Salinas to the Nominating Committee to meet and return to Board of Directors on January 22, 2014 with recommendations for Board Chair, 1st Vice Chair, 2nd Vice Chair, and Executive Committee to serve one-year terms beginning upon their election through the next election of officers at the beginning of the January 28, 2015 Board meeting.
8. **RECEIVED** report on draft agenda for TAMC Board meeting of December 4, 2013.

Executive Director Hale reviewed the December 4, 2013 draft agenda. She reported that the big item on the agenda is the adoption of the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program for Monterey County, to be submitted for inclusion in the 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program. She noted that the Board will receive an update on the SR 156 improvement project supplemental environmental document and financing options. A public hearing on the Unmet Transit Needs will be held and the Board will be asked to appoint a nominating committee for the 2014 Chair, 1st Vice Chair, 2nd Vice Chair, and Executive Committee. Director Hale reported under the consent agenda the Board will be asked to approve the calendar year 2014 schedule of meetings for the Board and Executive Committee. Also on the consent agenda is an agreement for accounting services with Oppidea, a contract for Computer and Network Services, and the contract for the Triennial performance audit reports. The Board will also be asked to approve Amendment number 2, for the Caltrans 156 Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans; contract extension with Meyers Nave to provide the Agency with legal services through June 30, 2014; and the use of $130,000 in State Transportation Improvement Program funds budgeted for the Coast Daylight project.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Edelen adjourned the meeting at 10:21 a.m.

[Signature]

Elouise Rodriguez, Senior Administrative Assistant
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee
From: Christina Watson, Principal Transportation Planner
Meeting Date: January 8, 2014
Subject: Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act

RECOMMENDED ACTION

RECEIVE report on proposed federal bicycle and pedestrian legislation.

SUMMARY

This report contains information about a new federal proposal to set new measures and targets for bicycle and pedestrian safety, separate from motorized transportation safety measures and targets.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

No financial impact.

DISCUSSION

On November 14, 2013, Congressmen Earl Blumenauer, the founder of the House Bicycle Caucus, introduced the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act (see attached memo and article). The bill would require the US Department of Transportation to set separate measures for motorized and non-motorized safety. States would be able to set their own safety targets and have the flexibility to choose the best methods to meet them. The legislation encourages states to make their roadways safer without diverting funding from other safety needs. According to the Politico article,

"The bill is in response to concerns in the bike community that the Department of Transportation will ignore bikers and walkers when it sets the performance standards to measure how effective road projects are at meeting goals like reducing congestion and improving safety. Advocates point to what they call a stunning misalignment of the needs and the resources: While bikers and pedestrians account for 15 percent of all highway deaths, they get only 1 percent of the safety-related funding."
Staff will continue to watch this bill. It is likely that the bill will be included in the transportation authorization legislation that will be considered over the next few years.

Approved by: ___________________________  Date signed: 12/10/13
Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Consent Agenda

Agency Counsel Review: N/A
Admin/Finance Approval: N/A

Attachments:
1. November 18, 2013 memo from Agency legislative consultants Alcalde & Fay
2. November 21, 2013 article in *Político*, “Earl Blumenauer’s ‘bike-partisanship’”
On November 14, 2013, a bipartisan Congressional coalition introduced the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act in both the House and Senate (H.R. 3494 and S. 1708, respectively). In the House, the bill was introduced by the founder of the Congressional Bike Caucus, Congressmen Earl Blumenauer (D-OR), along with fellow Caucus members Howard Coble (R-NC), Peter DeFazio (D-OR) and Mike McCaul (R-TX). The companion bill in the Senate was introduced by Senator Jeff Merkley (D-OR) and co-sponsored by Senators Kelly Ayotte (R-NH) and Brian Schatz (D-HI).

The bipartisan legislation would attempt to address the increasing number of traffic fatalities involving bicycling and walking by requiring that separate safety measures be set for motorized and non-motorized transportation. As required by MAP-21, the Department of Transportation must establish safety performance measures aimed at reducing the “number of serious injuries and fatalities,” which states and local MPOs are then required to meet or make significant progress toward meeting within two years. Under the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act, DOT would establish distinct performance measures for motorized and non-motorized safety, which states would then have to meet based on the timelines established in MAP-21 for implementing motorized transportation safety measures. The bill maintains state control over the process by allowing them to set their own safety targets as well as the best ways to reach those goals. However, as with the MAP-21 requirements for motorized transportation safety, if a state or MPO was unable to meet the federal standards, DOT could require that it allocate additional funding from within its federal apportionment for projects that would move it closer to meeting performance targets.

In his press release announcing the legislation, Congressman Blumenauer stressed the need for safer roadways, noting that as modern transportation systems “adjust to handle different type of road users, the federal government must encourage appropriate standards to ensure road user safety.” Congressman Coble also called attention to the fact that while overall traffic fatalities had dropped, the number of bicycling and pedestrian deaths on roadways had risen in recent years. The Congressman suggested that this bipartisan legislation would “protect all users of our transportation system, while giving states flexibility to enact measures that make sense for them.”
The two bills were referred to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) and Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committees, respectively. At this time it is unclear as to whether this legislation has a real chance of moving forward as a stand-alone bill in either chamber. However, with MAP-21 expiring on September 30, 2014 and Congress beginning discussions on the next surface transportation bill, this bill could be included in any such reauthorization effort.

If we may answer any questions or provide additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.
Bit more related to bill on which I sent info the other day.

Paul

Earl Blumenauer’s ‘bike-partisanship’

By: Adam Snider

November 21, 2013 05:10 AM EST

Rep. Earl Blumenauer is always open to a legislative bike ride with Republicans. In his latest effort, the bow-tied Oregon Democrat is offering a short and simple bill (<http://beta.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/3494/>) to ensure that federal regulators keep bicyclists and pedestrians in mind when setting safety standards for road projects. Blumenauer’s bill has two Republican co-sponsors who aren’t exactly known for working on bike issues: Rep. Howard Coble of North Carolina, a senior member of the Transportation Committee who is retiring after next year, and House Homeland Security Committee Chairman Mike McCaul of Texas. The bipartisan support for the pro-biking, pro-walking measure stretches into the Senate, too. A version (<http://beta.congress.gov/bill/113th/senate-bill/1708/>) in the upper chamber attracted New Hampshire Republican Kelly Ayotte, who co-sponsored the bill along with Democrats Jeff Merkley of Oregon and Brian Schatz of Hawaii when it was introduced last week. As with other transportation bills this year both big and small, Blumenauer hopes that a good bipartisan showing will help his measure cut through Congress’s usual legislative gridlock and partisan warfare. (PHOTOS: Politicians riding bikes)

His hope isn’t unfounded — there’s been a lot of precedent lately. House Transportation Committee Chairman Bill Shuster (R-Pa.) worked with Democrats to secure strong support for an $8 billion water-projects bill that sailed through the House in a lopsided 417-3 vote in late October. That victory came despite the opposition of conservative groups as well as Congress’s ban on earmarks, which in past years could have helped secure votes from reluctant members. Also in October, President Barack Obama signed a bill involving sleep apnea testing for truck drivers just a month after a bipartisan pair of Transportation Committee lawmakers had introduced the legislation. Those successes came on the heels of a minor miracle last year: In an election year, Democrats and Republicans came together to pass both aviation and surface transportation bills that cost tens of billions of dollars and involved several sticky policy issues, such as how high the subsidies for small airports should be and how much money from gasoline taxes the government should spend on projects that aren’t for roads. “Most of all, the initiatives that I’m a part of are or should be bipartisan,” Blumenauer said in an interview in the speaker’s lobby. The bespectacled Democrat, known for wearing colorful bike pins and bringing fruitcake to reporters over the holiday season, joked that he’s a big fan of “bike-partisanship.” “Life’s too short, and I think infrastructure is a natural bipartisan platform,” he said.

Blumenauer is one of the more active members during House votes, one of his aides said. Even though votes are pretty much the only time all House members gather in the same room, many lawmakers spend the time checking their phones or chatting casually with colleagues.
But not Blumenauer — he talks up issues and legislation with fellow members. In the case of his bike bill, his outreach paid off. Coble, who announced recently amid health problems that he won’t run for reelection next year, admitted he’s only “vaguely familiar” with Blumenauer’s bill. So why is he a co-sponsor? His reason points to just how much personal relationships matter on the Hill and the lasting power of transportation’s bipartisan tradition: “I’m really not that familiar with the bill. I just signed on because Earl asked me to, told me he was promoting it,” Coble said. The North Carolina lawmaker, at 82 years old, said he “wouldn’t think about riding a bike to work in a rural area like my district, much less up here” in Washington. The bill is in response to concerns in the bike community that the Department of Transportation will ignore bikers and walkers when it sets the performance standards to measure how effective road projects are at meeting goals like reducing congestion and improving safety. Advocates point to what they call a stunning misalignment of the needs and the resources: While bikers and pedestrians account for 15 percent of all highway deaths, they get only 1 percent of the safety-related funding. “DOT has taken a very narrow definition of what they can include in the performance measures,” said Andy Clarke, president of the League of American Bicyclists. Several bike advocacy sources who are working with DOT on the issue said bureaucrats at the Federal Highway Administration, used to working on road projects that focus almost entirely on cars and trucks, have been the biggest obstacle in getting the agency to address biker and pedestrian concerns. A DOT spokeswoman wouldn’t address the standards directly but said the agency has done a lot for biking and walking. DOT “is deeply committed to ensuring public safety by reducing traffic-related injuries and fatalities on our roadways, including bicycle and pedestrian safety,” the spokeswoman said, noting the $154 million from a discretionary grant program that has gone to bike and pedestrian projects over the years. “DOT will continue its commitment to improving safety across all modes of transportation, whether people choose to travel by car, plane, train, bike or foot,” the official said. Rep. Peter DeFazio (D-Ore.), also a co-sponsor of Blumenauer’s bill, said it’s hard for road engineers to change their mind-set to think of walkers and bikers when designing a highway even though doing so “makes an infinite amount of sense.” “Highway engineers, it wasn’t part of their education,” DeFazio said. “It’s not part of their daily experience. They’re just thinking about throughput and congestion and all those sorts of things.” Blumenauer’s bill would address the issue by forcing DOT to issue separate performance standards for motorized and nonmotorized transportation that would be used in the Highway Safety Improvement Program. The bill is likely to get lost in the year-end shuffle as Congress turns to some major legislative fights in early 2014. But with the deadline for a new surface transportation bill looming Sept. 30, 2014, Blumenauer can try to push for its inclusion in the broader highway and transit package — while still leaving time for a bike ride with a reluctant GOP lawmaker.
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee
From: Christina Watson, Principal Transportation Planner
Meeting Date: January 8, 2014
Subject: California Road Repairs Act of 2014

RECOMMENDED ACTION
RECEIVE update on proposed statewide transportation ballot measure.

SUMMARY
Two statewide transportation organizations have proposed a ballot measure for November 2014, the “California Road Repairs Act of 2014”. This report provides information on this proposal.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
No financial impact.

DISCUSSION
Transportation California and the California Alliance for Jobs believe a 1% annual fee on the value of all motor vehicles to fund a new “California Road Repair Fund” best meets the current and future funding needs of California’s road and transit systems. The proposal would phase in this fee in ¼% increments over four years. The annual total estimate of revenue raised is estimated to be $2.9 billion per year when the rate reaches 1% in 2018 or nearly $25 billion over the first ten years.

Attached is a memo from the proponents of this measure, Will Kempton, Transportation California, and James Earp, California Alliance for Jobs, explaining the purpose and need for the proposed ballot measure. Online as a web attachment is the proposed “California Road Repairs Act of 2014” ballot measure language. Staff will continue to watch this proposal and will bring more information to the Committee when it is available.

Approved by: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director
Date signed: 1/3/14
Consent Agenda
Agency Counsel Review: N/A
Admin/Finance Approval: N/A
Attachment: November 19, 2013 memo re: Decision to Request the Attorney General of California draft "Title and Summary" for a new "California Road Repairs Act"
Web Attachment: California Road Repairs Act of 2014
Date: November 19, 2013
From: Will Kempton and James Earp
To: All Interested Public and Private Transportation Entities and Colleagues
cc: Chair and Members, Transportation California Board of Directors, Transportation Secretary
Brian Kelly, Transportation Director Malcolm Dougherty, Chair and All Members, California Transportation Commission
Subject: Decision to Request the Attorney General of California draft "Title and Summary"
for a new "California Road Repairs Act"

Yesterday, on behalf of Transportation California and the California Alliance for Jobs, we jointly submitted a request for title and summary for a proposed constitutional amendment that would provide a new source of transportation funding to address the state’s critical roadway and transit preservation fiscal crisis.

On November 5th the Transportation California Board of Directors authorized a collaboration to join with the California Alliance for Jobs to take this first serious step towards placing a new transportation funding measure on the November 2014 General Election ballot. Together, Transportation California and the Alliance for Jobs have worked diligently over the past 2 years on this effort, including substantial political survey research that has led us to this point of submitting initiative measure language.

We want to make it perfectly clear to everyone receiving this notification that Transportation California and the Alliance for Jobs, along with our coalition of interested parties, has NOT made a final decision to pursue such a measure in 2014. We are simply keeping our options open.

We intend to jointly take the necessary steps to make a final determination on whether our measure will have sufficient voter support to move forward in 2014. We anticipate that the official ballot label language will be available by the first week of January. Polling results on that language should be available to us by the end of the second week in January, and this, along with consultation with other interested parties, will determine whether we will move forward on this effort in 2014.

For your background, we have provided an overview summary of the language we have submitted along with a brief overview of the worsening transportation funding crisis we are confronting here in California.

Sincerely,

Will Kempton, Executive Director
Transportation California
1111 L Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 446-1280
wkempton@transportationca.com

James Earp, Executive Director
California Alliance for Jobs
1415 L Street, Suite 1080
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-446-2259
jearp@rebuildca.org
Our Transportation Funding Challenge

California has a critical need to implement a new revenue measure that would support maintenance and rehabilitation of its state and local road and transit systems. This new revenue source should be independent of fossil fuel consumption, increase over time at a rate that is equal to or greater than inflation, and produce enough revenue to significantly reduce the huge backlog of unmet road, bridge and transit maintenance and rehabilitation costs.

After a great deal of technical, financial and voter opinion research over the last three years, Transportation California believes a 1% annual fee on the value of all motor vehicles to fund a new “California Road Repair Fund”, best meets the current and future funding needs of California’s road and transit systems as described in the previous paragraph.

California Road Repair Act:
Program Summary

- Assess an annual California Road Repair Fee on all vehicles, excluding heavy duty trucks (over 10,000 lbs.), equal to 1% of each vehicles’ value in ¼% increments phased in over four years. The annual total estimate of revenue raised is estimated to be $2.9 billion per year when the rate reaches 1% in 2018 or nearly $25 billion over the first ten years. Heavy trucks will pay a fair share equivalent increase in the diesel tax, which they prefer to a vehicle fee based on “value”.

- All new revenue raised must be used exclusively for road, bridge and transit system maintenance, rehabilitation and transit vehicle replacement only.

- The revenue would be allocated as follows:
  - 25% of all new revenue to all cities in California distributed on a formula allocation based on population.
  - 25% of all new revenue to all counties in California based on a formula allocation equal to 75% of fee-paying vehicle and 25% road miles.
  - 40% of all new revenue to the State Highway System based on a formula allocation of ½ allocated 60% to Southern California, 40% to Northern California, and ½ allocated on a “highest need” basis statewide.
  - 10% of all new revenue to public transit system maintenance, rehabilitation and vehicle replacement based on the current State Transit Assistance Program formula.

- This is a “pay as you go” proposition, with 100% of the new revenue going to the purposes enumerated above, not bondholders.

- All new funds raised in the Act would be constitutionally dedicated only for the purposes enumerated above and not available for reallocation or loan for any other purpose, without a new authorization by the voters.

- The Act will also incorporate several Taxpayer Safeguards to ensure that the funds are effectively managed and utilized in conformity with the voters understanding. These include a cap on administrative costs and a requirement for forthright progress reports and audits.
November 18, 2013

VIA PERSONAL DELIVERY

The Honorable Kamala D. Harris.
Attorney General
1300 I Street, 17th Floor, P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 95814

Attention: Ashley Johansson, Initiative Coordinator

Re: Request for Title and Summary for Proposed Initiative Constitutional Amendment

Dear Ms. Harris:

Pursuant to Article II, Section 10(d) of the California Constitution, we hereby submit the attached proposed Initiative Constitutional Amendment, entitled the "California Road Repairs Act of 2014," to your office and request that you prepare a title and summary of the measure as provided by law. Included with this submission is the required proponent affidavits signed by the proponents of this measure pursuant to Section 9608 of the California Elections Code. Our addresses as registered voters are attached to this letter, along with a check for $200.00.

All inquiries or correspondence relative to this initiative should be directed to Nielsen, Merksamer, Parrinello, Gross & Leoni, LLP, 1415 L Street, Suite 1200, Sacramento, CA 95814, (916) 446-6752, Attention: Kurt Oneto (telephone: 916/446-6752).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Will Kempton, Proponent

James Earp, Proponent

Enclosure: Proposed Initiative Constitutional Amendment
Section 1. Title.

This act shall be known, and may be cited as, the California Road Repairs Act of 2014.

Section 2. Findings and Declarations.

(a) Maintaining our local streets, roads, and highways is a critical priority to protect our economy, our environment, and our quality of life.

(b) However, the vast majority of California’s roads and highways were built decades ago and are rapidly aging and in major need of repairs now.

(c) According to a recent report by the California Transportation Commission, 58 percent of state roads need rehabilitation and/or pavement maintenance, 20 percent of state bridges require major maintenance or preventative work, and 6 percent of the state’s bridges need to be replaced. At the local level, 55 percent of roads need to be repaired or replaced.

(d) The poor condition of our roads costs the average California driver more than $600 every year in vehicle maintenance costs.

(e) At the same time, more drivers and higher rates of vehicle travel are creating greater traffic congestion on streets and highways around the state. Nearly 70 percent of California’s urban roads and highways are congested, causing significant delays in traffic, public safety issues, and increased air pollution from idling vehicles.

(f) This worsening traffic congestion costs California motorists an estimated $18.7 billion annually in lost time and fuel, and increases the amount of harmful pollutants that damage the environment.

(g) California is facing a transportation funding crisis. Prior transportation funding measures expire this year. Beginning in 2014, state and local transportation

[1]
funds will be cut in half even though our need to repair and maintain roads has never been greater.

(h) What’s more, the state Legislature has continually diverted money that is supposed to fund transportation improvements to non-transportation state budget items, robbing critical transportation funding and worsening the condition of our roads, bridges, and highways.

(i) We need to keep up with road maintenance or it will cost us much more to make repairs later. Every $1 in maintenance we put off today will end up costing $50 in more expensive replacements later.

(j) The California Road Repairs Act would provide essential funding for critical road repairs, maintenance, and expansion across the state, including: improving roads with known safety hazards; maintaining and rehabilitating local streets and roads; repairing and replacing aging bridges; maintaining and expanding state freeways and highways to reduce traffic congestion; and investing in local mass transit and rail.

(k) This act will create thousands of jobs and billions in economic growth—putting people to work and helping our recovering economy.

(l) The act also requires strict annual financial audits, to be made publicly available, to insure maximum accountability and transparency.

Section 3. Statement of Purpose.

The purpose of this measure is to improve our economy and environment while preventing deterioration of our transportation system and reducing auto maintenance bills by providing a secure funding source to make essential repairs to California’s roads.
Section 4. Article XIX D is added to the Constitution of the State of California, to read:

ARTICLE XIX D

California Road Repairs Fund

SECTION 1. The California Road Repairs Fund is hereby created in the State Treasury. The Legislature shall not divert revenues intended for deposit into the Fund; and shall not borrow revenues from the Fund or from any other fund or account that receives revenues from the Fund. Revenues that are deposited into, or distributed out of, the Fund shall only be used for the specific purposes identified in this article.

SECTION 2. (a) A California road repairs fee at the rate of 1.00 percent of the market value of a vehicle is hereby imposed for the purposes of this article. The fee shall be imposed in increments of 0.25 percent over four years, as follows:

(1) From January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015, the rate of imposition shall be 0.25 percent.

(2) From January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016, the rate of imposition shall be 0.50 percent.

(3) From January 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017, the rate of imposition shall be 0.75 percent.

(4) From January 1, 2018 and thereafter, the rate of imposition shall be 1.00 percent.

(b) The California road repairs fee imposed pursuant to this section shall be collected and administered in the same manner, and subject to the same exceptions and exclusions, as the vehicle license fee imposed under the Vehicle License Fee Law (Part 5 [commencing with Section 10701] of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code), or its successor, except as otherwise required by this article.

(c) Revenue collected during each fiscal year from the fee imposed pursuant to this section, over and above the costs of collection and refunds authorized by law, shall be deposited into the California Road Repairs Fund.
(d) The revenues collected pursuant to this section are not subject to Section 15 of Article XI or to Article XIX.

(e)(1) Notwithstanding subdivision (a) and subdivision (b), commercial motor vehicles operated either singly or in combination with a declared gross vehicle weight of 10,001 pounds or more shall be exempt from the road repairs fee imposed pursuant to this section until July 1, 2016. If prior to July 1, 2016 the Diesel Fuel Tax (Part 31 [commencing with Section 60001] of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code) is increased by three cents per gallon or more, so that commercial motor vehicles are paying their fair share to repair California’s roads, then the exemption from the road repairs fee shall remain in effect. If the Diesel Fuel Tax is not increased by three cents per gallon or more prior to July 1, 2016, then the exemption for commercial motor vehicles from the road repairs fee imposed pursuant to this section shall cease to apply. If the Diesel Fuel Tax is increased by three cents per gallon or more prior to July 1, 2016 but later reduced or repealed, the exemption for commercial motor vehicles from the road repairs fee imposed pursuant to this section shall cease to apply as of the date of the reduction or repeal.

(2) In order for the exemption in paragraph (1) for commercial motor vehicles to apply on or after July 1, 2016, any increase in the Diesel Fuel Tax (Part 31 [commencing with Section 60001] of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code) must contain an annual adjustment factor to incorporate any increase or decrease in inflation as measured by the Consumer Price Index published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics.

SECTION 3. (a) Notwithstanding any other statute, regulation, or other law to the contrary, all moneys, revenues, and funds identified in subdivision (a) of Section 183.1 of the Streets and Highways Code, as that section read on November 1, 2013, over and above the costs of collection and refunds authorized by law, shall be deposited into the California Road Repairs Fund.

(b) This article supersedes, and shall be controlling over, any other statute, regulation, or other law which creates a different method of depositing, distributing, or
using moneys, revenues, and funds identified in subdivision (a) of Section 183.1 of the Streets and Highways Code, as that section read on November 1, 2013.

(c) If the Legislature reduces or repeals any of the moneys, revenues, or funds (or the sources thereof) identified in subdivision (a) of Section 183.1 of the Streets and Highways Code, as that section read on November 1, 2013, and adopts an alternative source of revenue to replace those moneys, revenues, or funds, the replacement revenue shall be deposited into the California Road Repairs Fund, and shall be distributed pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 4. All other provisions of this article shall apply to any revenues adopted or raised by the Legislature to replace the moneys, revenues, or funds identified in subdivision (a) of Section 183.1 of the Streets and Highways Code, as that section read on November 1, 2013.

(d) Any statute passed by the Legislature, or any action taken by the Treasurer or Director of Finance or other state or local official, between November 1, 2013 and the date this article becomes effective which attempts to encumber, bond against, covenant, securitize, commit as security, or otherwise bind, restrict, or limit the use of the moneys, revenues, and funds deposited into the California Road Repairs Fund pursuant to this section are hereby repealed and shall forever be null and void.

SECTION 4. (a) Revenues deposited into the California Road Repairs Fund pursuant to Section 2 shall be continuously appropriated from the Fund without regard to fiscal years in the following proportions for expenditure solely for the following purposes:

(1) 40 percent for deposit into the State Highway Account in the State Transportation Fund to fund the State Highway Operation and Protection Program pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 163 and Section 164.6 of the Streets and Highways Code, as those sections read on November 1, 2013. Funds provided under this paragraph shall be apportioned as follows:

(A) 50 percent of the funds provided under this paragraph shall be distributed at the discretion of the Department of Transportation among the various areas of the state.
(B) 50 percent of the funds provided under this paragraph shall be distributed according to the Barnes-Mills-Walsh formula contained in Section 188 of the Streets and Highways Code, as that section read on November 1, 2013, between the counties included in Group 1 and the counties included in Group 2. For purposes of this subparagraph, the division of counties into Group 1 and Group 2 shall be based on the designation made in Section 187 of the Streets and Highways Code, as that section read on November 1, 2013. The apportionment of funds provided under this subparagraph shall be further broken down as follows:

(i) 75 percent of the funds provided under this subparagraph shall be apportioned among the counties in each Group in the proportion that the total population of the county bears to the total population of all the counties in the Group.

(ii) 25 percent of the funds provided under this subparagraph shall be apportioned among the counties in each Group in the proportion that the number of lane miles of state highways in each county bears to the total number of lane miles of state highways in the Group.

(2) 25 percent for deposit into the Highway Users Tax Account for road and highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or storm damage repair conducted by counties, including a city and county, in accordance with the following formulas:

(A) 75 percent of the funds provided under this paragraph shall be distributed among the counties in the proportion that the number of fee-paid and exempt vehicles that are registered in the county bears to the number of fee-paid and exempt vehicles registered in the state.

(B) 25 percent of the funds provided under this paragraph shall be distributed among the counties in the proportion that the number of miles of maintained county roads in each county bears to the total number of miles of maintained county roads in the state. For purposes of distributing funds under this subparagraph, any roads within the boundaries of a city and county that are not state highways shall be deemed to be county roads.
(3) 25 percent for deposit into the Highway Users Tax Account for street and highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or storm damage repair conducted by cities, including a city and county. Funds provided under this paragraph shall be distributed among the cities in the proportion that the total population of the city bears to the total population of all the cities in the state, provided, however, that each city shall be allocated a minimum of $400,000 pursuant to this paragraph.

(4) 10 percent for deposit into the Public Transportation Account in the State Transportation Fund to fund public transit, as defined in subdivision (f) of Section 1 of Article XIX A. The funds payable under this paragraph shall be used for capital maintenance and transit system and equipment rehabilitation and replacement purposes. Funds distributed under this paragraph shall be distributed as follows:

(A) 50 percent shall be distributed to eligible agencies using the formula contained in Section 99313 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on November 1, 2013.

(B) 50 percent shall be distributed to eligible agencies using the formula contained in Section 99314 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on November 1, 2013.

(b) Revenues deposited into the California Road Repairs Fund pursuant to Section 3 shall be continuously appropriated without regard to fiscal years for deposit into the State Highway Account in the State Transportation Fund for distribution to the Department of Transportation for the following purposes:

(1) To fund the State Highway Operation and Protection Program pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 163 and Section 164.6 of the Streets and Highways Code, as those sections read on November 1, 2013.

(2) For preventative maintenance.

(c) Eligible expenditures for transportation purposes under this section shall include the mitigation of environmental effects identified in an environmental impact report for a specific project, the payment for property taken or damaged for road repair
and public transit purposes, and the administrative costs necessarily incurred for those purposes.

(d) Consistent with the purpose of this article to fund road repairs rather than capital projects, revenues distributed to state, regional, and/or local government bodies pursuant to this article shall not be used for the repayment of any principal or interest on any bonds.

(e) The Legislature shall take no action with respect to the State Highway Account, the State Transportation Fund, the Highway Users Tax Account, or the Public Transportation Account which delays, undermines, interrupts, or in any way frustrates the distribution and expenditure of revenues derived from the California Road Repairs Fund, as specified in this section.

SECTION 5. (a) In the event that the Legislature, the Governor, or any other state official or agency seeks to divert or borrow revenues either collected pursuant to this article or otherwise deposited into the California Road Repairs Fund pursuant to this article, or both, either by way of statute or regulation or other method, for purposes other than those specified in this article, any taxpayer, both individual and corporate, of this state has standing to seek judicial relief against the Controller, Director of Finance, Governor, Treasurer, or any other state official to enjoin such unlawful action and recover any revenues improperly diverted or borrowed along with reasonable attorneys’ fees. Legal actions brought pursuant to this section shall not require the filing of a claim under Part 3 (commencing with Section 900) of Division 3.6 of Title 1 of the Government Code or any successor to that law.

(b) If any legal action brought pursuant to subdivision (a) is successful either by way of final judgment, settlement, or resolution by administrative or legislative action, there is hereby continuously appropriated from the General Fund to the Controller, without regard to fiscal years, both of the following:

(1) The amount necessary to restore the fund or account from which the revenues were unlawfully diverted, borrowed, or taken to its financial status had the unlawful action not been taken.
(2) An amount necessary to cover the reasonable attorneys’ fees incurred in bringing the legal action.

(c) Interest calculated at the Pooled Money Investment Fund rate from the date or dates the revenues were unlawfully diverted, borrowed, or taken shall accrue to the amounts required to be restored pursuant to this section. Within 30 days from the date a legal action is successful, the Controller shall make the transfer required by the continuous appropriation under paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) and issue a notice to the parties that the transfer has been completed.

(d) If in any legal action brought pursuant to this section a restraining order or preliminary injunction is sought or issued, the plaintiffs or petitioners shall not be required to post a bond obligating the plaintiffs or petitioners to indemnify the government defendants or the State of California for any damage the restraining order or preliminary injunction may cause.

SECTION 6. All revenues deposited into the California Road Repairs Fund pursuant to this article shall be used only to supplement existing levels of funding for state and local highways, streets, and roads, and public transit. No moneys in the California Road Repairs Fund shall be used to supplant existing sources of funds generally available for state and local highways, streets, and roads or for public transit.

SECTION 7. (a) This article shall become effective in accordance with subdivision (a) of Section 10 of Article II of this Constitution.

(b) Section 3 of this article shall become operative the first July 1 following the effective date of this article.

SECTION 8. (a) All state, regional, and local government bodies receiving funds pursuant to this article shall, on an annual basis, provide an accounting of the amount of money received and how it was spent. The accounting shall include an audit of program and project expenditures and outcomes. The accounting shall be published on the respective body’s Internet Web site.
(b) All state, regional, and local government bodies that administer programs and projects receiving funding pursuant to this article shall report on the activities and progress made toward the implementation of those programs and projects at least once every three years from the effective date of this article. The report shall, at a minimum, be provided to the Governor, the Legislature, and the California Transportation Commission, and shall be published on the respective body’s Internet Web site.

(c) Not more than three percent of the funds provided to any state, regional, or local government body pursuant to this article shall be used for administrative costs, including the requirements imposed by subdivision (a) and subdivision (b).

Section 5. Section 13 of Article XIII B of the Constitution of the State of California is amended, to read:

SEC. 13. "Appropriations subject to limitation" of each entity of government shall not include appropriations of revenue from the California Children and Families First Trust Fund created by the California Children and Families First Act of 1998 or the California Road Repairs Fund created by the California Road Repairs Act of 2014. No adjustment in the appropriations limit of any entity of government shall be required pursuant to Section 3 as a result of revenue being deposited in or appropriated from the California Children and Families First Trust Fund or the California Road Repairs Fund. The surtax created by the California Children and Families First Act of 1998 and the revenues created by, or deposited into, the California Road Repairs Fund pursuant to the California Road Repairs Act of 2014 shall not be considered General Fund revenues for the purposes of Section 8 of Article XVI.

Section 6. Liberal Construction.

This act shall be liberally construed in order to effectuate its purposes.

Section 7. Conflicting Measures.

In the event that this measure and another measure or measures relating to road repair and transportation funding, or to charges or fees imposed on motor vehicles, shall appear on the same statewide election ballot, the other measure or measures shall be
deemed to be in conflict with this measure. In the event that this measure receives a greater number of affirmative votes, the provisions of this measure shall prevail in their entirety, and the provisions of the other measure or measures shall be null and void.

Section 8. Severability.

The provisions of this Act are severable. If any section, subdivision, paragraph, clause, phrase, or word of this Act is for any reason held to be invalid by a decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, that decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Act. The People of the State of California hereby declare that they would have adopted this Act and each and every section, subdivision, paragraph, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any portion of this Act would be subsequently declared invalid.
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee
From: Sharon Gavin, Community Outreach Coordinator
Meeting Date: January 08, 2014
Subject: Transportation Excellence Awards Selection

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

APPROVE recommendations for the 12th annual Transportation Excellence Awards.

SUMMARY:

The Transportation Agency received eight nominations for the Transportation Excellence Awards. The awards ceremony will be held during the January 22, 2014 Board meeting.

DISCUSSION:

The Transportation Agency would like to show its appreciation to the local community for its outstanding efforts to improve transportation in Monterey County. Staff received a total of ten nominations in the Project, Program and Individuals/Group categories.

Staff recommends that the four individuals, four projects, and two programs listed in the web attachment be awarded Transportation Excellence Awards.

Back up information such as pictures and supporting documentation is available upon request.

Approved by: Debra Hale, Executive Director
Date signed: 12-16-13

Counsel Review N/A
Admin/Finance Review N/A

Web Attachment: Award Nominations
2013 Transportation Excellence Awards

Individuals:

Nominee: Casey Andrews
Category: Individual
Contact: Casey Andrews, candrews@csumb.edu
Description: Casey Andrews is being nominated for his work on TRIPwise, CSUMB's alternative transportation program. Casey's outreach work for transportation on campus is creative, fun, and noticeable. Of particular note are his work on the TRIPwise website (CSUMB.EDU/trip), and use of artistic means to promote alternative transportation, particularly the TRANSIT TREE poster. Casey has also been responsible for the deployment of the Transit Tree in CSUMB building lobbies and two bus stop shelters.

Due to the revolving nature of students on campus and the constant improvements/changes to the transportation systems serving CSUMB, Casey's efforts to provide ongoing outreach and effective, creative advertisements is important. CSUMB has seen a substantial increase in transit ridership. Casey has made outreach for transportation on campus more fun and noticeable; the entire CSUMB community has benefited from his work.

Nominee: Richard Vasquez
Category: Individual
Contact: Richard Vasquez, rivasquez@csumb.edu
Description: Richard Vasquez is being nominated for his work to create an identity package, marketing materials, and façade treatments for the CSUMB Bike Bunker, a TRIPwise project. This was his Senior Capstone project and included logos, advertisements, posters and postcards, facility name, print and online catalogue/rental info. Through the process, Richard developed the official bicycle icon of CSUMB and bicycle color scheme. He designed the façade/design aesthetics for the facility. This is the first approved campus project that does not adhere to campus color or font standards, so it took special permissions. He was also integral in naming the facility.

In his own words, “It has been amazing to see my work on campus and I hope that it inspires interest in cycling. Working with Megan (Tolbert) I have a greater understanding of how important alternative transportation is and what we need to do to enhance interest in cycling. Hopefully my work on the Bike Bunker helps that project gain student interest and increases the bike culture on campus. I think that TRIPwise is a great way to inform students about alternative transportation and let them know about different ways of getting around. I hope that I have made an impact on the campus bicycle community and that they embrace the Bike Bunker and any other future bike storage facility. Decreasing the amount of cars or trips in cars to and from campus is my ultimate goal. I believe we need to take care of our planet and I will try to make a difference for future generations by making wiser choices today.”

Nominee: Eric Petersen
Category: Individual
Contact: Eric Petersen, eric939@redshift.com
Description: Eric Petersen has been a transportation activist since he was 15 years old, and been volunteering for different transportation issues since he moved to Salinas in 1995. He has been with the City of Salinas' Traffic and Transportation Commission for 15 years, and has served as chair for five terms. He was instrumental in writing a portion of the alternative transportation section of the Salinas General Plan. In addition, he has been on TAMC's Bicycle Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee for 12 years. Eric is a long-time advocate for sustainable traffic solutions - promoting more than a dozen bicycle events in Salinas, and working with various non-profit groups to promote youth cycling.
Nominee: Jim Warwick
Category: Individual
Contact: Jim Warwick, jimwarwick@comcast.net
Description: Salinas High School used to have empty bike racks; now it has full racks plus kids locking bikes to fences. Jim Warwick is one reason behind that!

Jim is a Salinas High instructor and also an advisor and assistant coach for Salinas High Cowboys Racing mountain bike team. One way he encourages youth to bike, and bike safely, is giving them a way to adjust brakes, pump tires, and more at school. He and the team set up a bike maintenance station—the first on-campus bicycle maintenance station in Monterey County! Other ways Jim boosts biking include volunteering as a guide to help get Salinas Bike Party off to a positive start; acting as a riding role model for observing California bike laws and other Salinas Bike Party rules; being a supporter and positive role model at other bike community events, such as Critical Christmas Monterey; sorting parts at the Monterey County Probation Department Youth Center for a bike repair class for incarcerated local teens; and reaching out to get needed bikes for kids who couldn’t otherwise be on a team;

In addition, with the SHS Mountain Bike Team Jim makes sure girls are encouraged, not just boys. The team has more girls this year than ever before. Among many local Hispanics, far more males than females bike; Jim is helping to change that by supporting girls being on the team, thereby serving as role models for other girls interested in biking.

Projects:
Nominee: CSUMB Bike Bunker
Category: Project
Contact: Megan Tolbert mtolbert@csumb.edu
Description: The Bike Bunker project was developed and managed by Megan Tolbert. It is an indoor, secure membership-based bicycle parking facility on the CSUMB campus. The Bike Bunker has video surveillance, visual passage (for more safety), and membership-only swipe card access. The project, which began in 2011 and opened in 2013, included:

   a) Research – model based on Portland State University
   b) Grant writing – received MBUAPCD AB2766 grant for $100,000 (half of the requested funds)
   c) A Design Contest
   d) Facility Design and Construction
   e) Operations & Maintenance – coordinated with Student Activities to develop management, pricing, and ongoing maintenance structure.
   f) Identity Package
   g) Facility Naming

The Bike Bunker has spurred greater bike culture on campus and created a visible tribute to bicycles on campus, dedicated to commuters. The facility holds 32 bicycles and has various cost options for membership, and is currently FULL. Due to the campus policy disallowing bicycles indoors and a campus bike rental shop that does not allow bikes to be left on outdoor racks overnight, the Bike Bunker has filled a great demand for indoor, secure bike parking.

Nominee: Monterey Salinas Transit - JAZZ Bus Rapid Transit
Category: Project
Contact: Zoe Shoats, zshoats@mst.org
Description: The JAZZ BRT route serves the busy Fremont and Lighthouse corridor between the Monterey Bay Aquarium and Sand City. MST improved local streets and sidewalks, upgraded 24 traffic signals, installed queue jumps at two intersections, and expanded from five shelters to 19—increasing seating capacity by 71 percent. Construction was completed in April 2013, in conjunction with the Monterey Jazz Festival’s Next Generation Jazz Festival. The thousands of passengers who commute using this route daily have seen commute times cut by 18 percent, while also easing local traffic congestion.
Nominee: City of Monterey – Pacific/Del Monte Intersection Improvement Project

Category: Project

Contact: Rich Deal, deal@ci.monterey.ca.us

Description: In the last ten years, the intersection of Pacific / Del Monte experienced the highest number of vehicle-pedestrian crashes of any intersection in Monterey, three times more than any other location in the City. This project reversed that trend. The intersection improvements created better separation between vehicles turning left and pedestrians crossing Pacific Street, which was the primary cause of vehicle-pedestrian crashes. Two traffic islands were removed to eliminate the false assumption of right-of-way by west bound drivers turning left who were opposed by eastbound right turns, substantially reducing the potential for vehicle-pedestrian crashes in the south crosswalk. Signal improvements added countdown pedestrian heads and ADA audible push buttons for better pedestrian control. New mast arm signals increased stopping sight distance to reduce rear-end collisions. By increasing the number of safety lights from one to four, the intersection lighting increased substantially and fully illuminates all four crosswalks. New energy efficient LED pedestrian scale lighting illuminates the curb return areas. The visual interaction between opposing drivers was improved with turn lane channelization and re-alignment, along with clear signing and striping to discourage wrong-way traffic. The reconstructed curb returns and generous pedestrian landings are ADA compliant and reduce pedestrians' exposure while crossing the street. Decorative signal poles helped to create an entry statement that accentuates the Downtown setting.

Nominee: Caltrans – Rocky Creek Viaduct – State Route 1

Category: Project

Contact: Ken Dostalek, ken.dostalek@dot.ca.gov

Description: On March 16, 2011 a 100-foot long section of State Route 1 in Monterey County located about 1/10 mile south of the historic Rocky Creek Bridge collapsed due to a series of severe winter storms. Caltrans maintenance personnel immediately stabilized the highway which prevented further collapse but couldn't keep the southbound lane from being closed. Traffic signals were installed on either side of the damaged area allowing north and south bound traffic to take turns passing through, but this was just a temporary solution. The Rocky Creek Viaduct Project was developed to ensure long-term stability, as well as restore the highway back to its two-lane pre-collapse condition.

Design began in April of 2011. It was understood by all that the project needed be fast-tracked because having only one lane of traffic open was too great an inconvenience to the travelling public and there was concern that the surrounding area was still not completely stable. Monterey County Planning staff helped facilitate the project by providing fast turnaround for tasks such as issuing permits. County Supervisor Dave Potter's office was very helpful in facilitating public input, which was key to the success of the project. This collaborative effort produced a design that was completed in about half the time of a normal project.

Construction started in October of 2012. A big challenge facing construction staff during this phase was how to maintain an aggressive schedule while minimizing impacts to the travelling public. Once again, Supervisor Potter's office was very helpful in seeking public input for help with finding an acceptable balance. Caltrans District 5 Public Affairs Office played a key role in keeping the public informed and provided updates of any changes in the schedule. The project was completed in November of 2013.

The project team consisted of:
- Brian Fuller, CT Design, Project Engineer
- Wendy Waldron, CT Senior Environmental Planner
- Ryan Tumer, CT Geotechnical Engineer
- Heman Perez, CT Structures Design Engineer
- Bryan Parker, CT Landscape Architect, Visual Impacts Assessment
- Tyler Lavering, CT Construction, Resident Engineer
- Juan Moreno, CT Structures Construction Engineer
- Joe Sidor, Monterey County Planner
- Susana Cruz, CT Public Information Officer
- Kathleen Lee from Supervisor Potter's Office
- Ken Dostalek, CT Project Manager
Programs:
Nominee: ITN Monterey County
Category: Program
Contact: Nancy Budd-Garvan, Executive Director, nancy.budd@itnmontereycounty.org
Description: ITN Monterey County is a community-based, community-supported, economically viable and consumer-oriented transportation service for seniors and adults with visual impairment. The program addresses the problems of public safety, economic development and social isolation that exist in the County’s population of elderly and visually impaired adults. Senior drivers above the age of 70 are more likely to be involved in traffic accidents than any other group except very young drivers. Seniors who don’t drive and visually impaired individuals tend to become isolated from friends, social occasions and even family, which has been shown to affect health, both mental and physical. People who cannot drive are unable to patronize local businesses, such as grocery stores, pharmacies, department stores, beauty salons, restaurants and entertainment venues, which has a negative impact on the local economy. And, without transportation, they cannot access the centers and service organizations that have been established to provide services and activities for them.

ITN Monterey County makes our streets safer and allows individuals to stay connected to family, friends, community and the local economy.

Nominee: Ciclovía Salinas
Category: Program
Contact: Natalie Oliver, 831-262-1110, cicloviasalinas@gmail.com
Description: The idea behind Ciclovía Salinas is that Salinas is entitled to a safe and inclusive environment that promotes health and unity. The program’s mission is to encourage the residents of Salinas to utilize city streets – harvesting an overall sense of well-being and vitality through physical activity. With their first event, in October 2013, they worked to establish a platform of opportunity to adopt healthier habits in order to counteract major health issues. Ciclovía hopes to positively impact economic development in Salinas through a sustainable event that promotes local businesses. This event will restructure the culture of Salinas, fostering a new sense of belonging for the people.

The first Ciclovía Salinas was a tremendous undertaking, giving core team members an opportunity to develop extraordinary leadership skills. They earned the confidence of sponsors, donors, city leaders, media professionals, volunteers, and others. The following youth had an ongoing leadership role in this initiative.

- Ana Gabriela Ibarra
- José Eduardo Huerta
- María Cárdenas
- Natalie Oliver

Youth Volunteers serving in Ciclovía Salinas’ summer internships included:

- Ana Maciel
- Ariana Granados
- Gaby Manzo
- Javier Cardenas
- Luis Manzo
- Manuel Guadalupe Ontiveros
- Maritza Cardenas
- Miguel Alcalá
- Reyna Alcalá
- Ruben Gonzalez

Additional youth volunteers included:

- Camilo Vega
- María Molinero
- Mina Cuentas
- Noemi Mandujano

Ciclovía Salinas is helping to change negative public perceptions about Salinas (including East Salinas), which largely stem from Monterey County having had highest youth homicide rate in California for 2 of last 3 years of record, to which gang violence in Salinas was a contributor.
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee
From: Andy Cook, Associate Transportation Planner
Meeting Date: January 8, 2014
Subject: 2013 Annual Report

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

DISCUSS the basic concept for the 2013 Transportation Agency for Monterey County Annual Report.

SUMMARY:

The Transportation Agency 2013 Annual Report, which describes the Agency’s accomplishments and goals, will be distributed during the month of April.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Costs to prepare the 2013 Annual Report are included in the Agency’s approved budget. Staff estimates that the total cost for design, printing, postage and Spanish translation for the report will be $56,000.

DISCUSSION:

The Annual Report is a public outreach tool that the Agency has distributed by mail to Monterey County households since 2005. The 2013 report will summarize the Agency’s accomplishments in the last year, as well as describe important projects that are still in need of funding.

Staff will request that the Board approve an outline of the report at its January meeting, and is requesting input from the committee on the basic concept.

Approved by: __________________________________________________ Date signed: ______________________
Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Regular Agenda
Counsel Review: N/A
Admin/Finance Review: Yes
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee
From: Michael Zeller, Senior Transportation Planner
Meeting Date: January 8, 2014
Subject: Regional Surface Transportation Program Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

RECEIVE update the Regional Surface Transportation Program.

SUMMARY:

The Transportation Agency periodically programs Regional Surface Transportation Program funds to local projects. Transportation Agency staff is proposing to deprogram inactive projects with the unused funding returned to the program for use in an upcoming grant cycle. A future grant cycle, with updated guidelines is planned for Spring 2014.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The three-year estimated funding of Regional Surface Transportation Program for fiscal years 2014/15/16 is $3.6 million for fair share and $7.2 million for competitive grants.

DISCUSSION:

The Surface Transportation Program is a federal program that provides states and local jurisdictions with funding for highway improvements, street rehabilitation and transportation enhancements. The Transportation Agency receives an annual apportionment of Regional Surface Transportation Program funding, passed through the State. Because Monterey County didn’t have an urbanized area with a population of greater than 200,000 in the 1990 census, it qualified for the state exchange Surface Transportation Program, whereby Caltrans keeps the federal Surface Transportation Program apportionments for a region and gives the regional agency an equal amount of state cash.

The Transportation Agency distributes Regional Surface Transportation Program funding for three programs: fair-share, competitive and Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC). Monterey County and the cities receive fair-share Regional Surface Transportation Program funds based on their urbanized populations and road miles. The total fair share allocation over the next three years is estimated to be $3.6 million.
The table included as Attachment 1 is a listing of projects with Regional Surface Transportation Program fund balances as of November, 2013. The table indicates projects with balances by jurisdiction and by fund type – either fair share, competitive, or TLC.

Agency staff is proposing to deprogram projects that have not used their existing competitive or Transportation for Livable Communities fund balances within the three year “timely use of funds” provision of AB 1012, and use the funds in an upcoming Regional Surface Transportation Program grant cycle. Projects with fair share balances would not be affected. Staff is coordinating with implementing agencies to insure projects expected to proceed in the near future are not impacted. Jurisdictions with projects that are deprogrammed would have the ability to reapply.

The Transportation Agency also distributes part of the Regional Surface Transportation Program funding on a competitive basis to transportation projects based on a variety of criteria, including traffic volume and project deliverability. In this cycle, staff is proposing adding emphasis on incorporating walking, bicycling, and transit in all projects as appropriate utilizing the Complete Streets Guidelines and Checklist recently adopted by the Transportation Agency Board.

In recent years, the competitive grant cycle for Regional Surface Transportation Program funds has been on hold, as the available funding has been used to complete the construction of the US-101 San Juan Road interchange project. With the interchange project nearing completion, the Transportation Agency is seeking to begin a new grant cycle. This process in the past has involved the release of grant application materials by the Transportation Agency, and the Technical Advisory Committee establishing a subcommittee to review and rank project proposals. The estimated three-year total available for grant funds is $7.2 million.

In response to State audit findings; the Transportation Agency will also be updating its policies and procedures related to the Regional Surface Transportation Program. Transportation Agency staff will provide an update to the Executive Committee on the guidelines, as well as review policies for the distribution of fair share allocations, the timely use of funds, use of interest, project eligibility, and discuss criteria and procedures for future grant cycles.

Approved by: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Date signed: 12-16-13

Regular Agenda
Counsel Approval: N/A
Admin/Finance Approval: N/A

Attachment: Regional Surface Transportation Program Outstanding Balances
Web Attachment: Draft 2014 Regional Surface Transportation Guidelines
### Transportation Agency for Monterey County

#### Regional Surface Transportation Program

**Outstanding Balances as of November 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Carmel</td>
<td>San Carlos St repaving</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Carmel</td>
<td>Junipero, Ocean-8th, repave, streetscape</td>
<td>$171,000</td>
<td>$141,898</td>
<td>$29,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Carmel</td>
<td>Install Bike Racks</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Blackie Road Safety Improvement Project</td>
<td>$343,138</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$238,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Cynara Court</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Blackie Road Phase II</td>
<td>$319,679</td>
<td>$291,988</td>
<td>$27,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>San Juan Road Safety Improvement Project</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$42,930</td>
<td>$2,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>N A St, G River Rd-2nd, rehab</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>Fair Share Reserve</td>
<td>$71,859</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>Fair Share Reserve</td>
<td>$70,916</td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Public Works &amp; Transit Facility Paving Project</td>
<td>$213,661</td>
<td>$24,446</td>
<td>$189,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Fair Share Reserve</td>
<td>$18,024</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Public Works &amp; Transit Facility Paving Project</td>
<td>$6,339</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>El Camino Real Downtown Streetscape Project</td>
<td>$15,139</td>
<td>$9,383</td>
<td>$5,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>El Camino Real Downtown Streetscape Project</td>
<td>$9,761</td>
<td>$9,740</td>
<td>$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>MST Transit Village</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>3137 Crescent Ave. ROW Purchase</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$51,756</td>
<td>$244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>68 Ragsdale</td>
<td>$590,000</td>
<td>$205,758</td>
<td>$384,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Holman HWY/ CHOMP Roundabout</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$253,009</td>
<td>$146,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Citywide Signal Coordination</td>
<td>$24,915</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Fremont/Del Monte Signal Upgrade</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$39,112</td>
<td>$888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>Citywide Maintenance</td>
<td>$131,093</td>
<td>$92,150</td>
<td>$38,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>Lighthouse Av, Eardley-Fountain, rehab</td>
<td>$459,000</td>
<td>$437,135</td>
<td>$21,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>Citywide Transportation Maintenance</td>
<td>$133,061</td>
<td>$129,063</td>
<td>$3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>Speed Zone Changes</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
<td>$18,348</td>
<td>$2,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>Eardley Av./Central Av Inter</td>
<td>$29,777</td>
<td>$29,650</td>
<td>$127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Harris Rd. Rehabilitation Project</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Gateway Apartments</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$30,400</td>
<td>$169,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>East Market St. Phase 3</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$156,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Alisal - Skyway Roundabout</td>
<td>$138,623</td>
<td></td>
<td>$138,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Lupine - Pedestrian enhancements - Front St &amp; East Alisal.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$35,620</td>
<td>$64,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Sidewalk Repairs Program</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Sanborn Rd. - John St. Intersection Improvement</td>
<td>$27,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Alisal - Skyway Roundabout</td>
<td>$11,377</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>E Market, Garner, Calle Cebu, Sunrise, rehab</td>
<td>$1,606,977</td>
<td>$1,606,878</td>
<td>$98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Annual City St. Rehab</td>
<td>$1,551,601</td>
<td>$1,551,600</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>California Av, Sylvan-Tioga, overlay</td>
<td>$112,004</td>
<td></td>
<td>$112,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>Broadway Ave. Improvements</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$192,042</td>
<td>$307,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>PMS Implementation</td>
<td>$347,714</td>
<td>$256,309</td>
<td>$85,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>Lighted Crosswalk Upgrade</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>Speed Survey</td>
<td>$37,246</td>
<td>$24,961</td>
<td>$12,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>Final Design &amp; Construction of Coe Avenue Bikeway</td>
<td>$70,396</td>
<td>$68,201</td>
<td>$2,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fair Share Total:** $2,035,475  
**Competitive Total:** $854,471  
**TLC Total:** $633,980
What is the Regional Surface Transportation Program?
The Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) was established by California State Statute utilizing Surface Transportation Program Funds that are identified in Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code. The State of California allows smaller counties to exchange their apportionment of federal RSTP funds for State Highway Account funds, which are easier for local agencies to use for transportation with less stringent paperwork than with federal funds.

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) distributes these funds to local agencies as part of its responsibilities as a Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

Project Eligibility
RSTP funding is eligible for a wide variety of transportation projects. In general projects must meet the criteria in Sections 133(b) and 133(c) of Title 23 of the United States Code (USC) and Article XIX of the State Constitution (Appendix A). Projects eligible for funding from the RSTP include:

- Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational improvements on
  - Federal-aid highways (i.e., on any highways, including NHS and Interstate Highways that are not functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors).
  - Bridges (including bridges on public roads of all functional classifications), including any such construction or reconstruction necessary to accommodate other transportation modes, and including the seismic retrofit and painting of and application of calcium magnesium acetate on bridges and approaches and other elevated structures.
- Mitigation of damage to wildlife, habitat, and ecosystems caused by a transportation project funded under RSTP.
- Capital costs for transit projects eligible for assistance under the Federal Transit Act and publicly owned intracity or intercity bus terminals and facilities.
- Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, and bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways on any public roads in accordance with Section 217 of Title 23, U.S.C.
- Highway and transit safety improvements and programs, hazard elimination, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife, and railway-highway grade crossings. Safety improvements are eligible on public roads of all functional classifications
- Highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs.
- Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management and control facilities and programs.
- Surface transportation planning programs
- Transportation enhancement activities.
- Transportation control measures listed in Section 108 (f)(1)(A) (other than clauses xii & xvi) of the Clean Air Act.
- Development and establishment of management systems under Section 303 of Title 23, U.S.C.
- Wetlands mitigation efforts related to RSTP projects.

**Funding Levels**
The following table shows the total amount of RSTP funding apportioned to TAMC since Fiscal Year 1991/92 (as of November 2013):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Apportionment</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Flood Repair Reimbursement</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91-92, 92-93</td>
<td>$2,858,528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,858,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93/94</td>
<td>$2,423,472</td>
<td>$155,272</td>
<td>$423,000</td>
<td>$2,941,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94/95</td>
<td>$2,817,633</td>
<td>$174,030</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,411,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95/96</td>
<td>$1,987,659</td>
<td>$174,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,161,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96/97</td>
<td>$2,270,101</td>
<td>$232,429</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,502,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97/98</td>
<td>$2,449,175</td>
<td>$309,011</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,758,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98/99</td>
<td>$2,864,522</td>
<td>$319,221</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,183,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/00</td>
<td>$2,670,544</td>
<td>$565,807</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,236,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>$3,288,365</td>
<td>$521,364</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,809,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>$3,460,201</td>
<td>$331,485</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,791,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03</td>
<td>$2,911,306</td>
<td>$208,581</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,119,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>$3,484,606</td>
<td>$203,109</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,687,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05</td>
<td>$4,168,498</td>
<td>$245,186</td>
<td>$2,571</td>
<td>$4,416,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>$3,857,207</td>
<td>$520,490</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,377,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>$4,044,157</td>
<td>$585,140</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,629,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>$3,863,139</td>
<td>$332,462</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,195,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>$4,177,999</td>
<td>$93,881</td>
<td>-$253,001</td>
<td>$4,018,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>$3,964,507</td>
<td>$60,151</td>
<td>$47,646</td>
<td>$4,072,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>$4,721,239</td>
<td>$29,115</td>
<td>$1,955,682</td>
<td>$6,706,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>$4,721,239</td>
<td>$53,317</td>
<td>$23,821</td>
<td>$4,798,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>$5,112,619</td>
<td>$52,503</td>
<td>-$3,000,000</td>
<td>$2,165,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash Received $72,116,716   $5,166,749   $2,199,720   $79,483,185

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apportionments Disbursed</th>
<th>$62,372,874</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Disbursed</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash on Hand</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programming of Regional Surface Transportation Program Funds

Since 1991, TAMC has funded transportation projects in three grant categories, Fair Share, Transportation for Livable Communities, and Competitive. The Transportation Agency also sets aside RSTP in a reserve for use on eligible transportation projects by the Agency. These categories are described below.

RSTP Reserve: RSTP Reserve is an approved TAMC policy that reserves up to 10% of the annual RSTP funding amount off the top for use by TAMC for eligible transportation project and planning activities. The reserve amount has historically been $200,000 annually.

RSTP Fair-Share Allocation Process: RSTP Fair Share is an approved TAMC policy that apportions part of the RSTP funding by formula to the Cities and County of Monterey. The Fair Share amount has historically been $1,200,000 annually. TAMC has distributed this Fair Share funding every two to three years. The distribution of Fair Share funds is based on population and approved by the Board of Directors.

The programming is based on each jurisdiction’s share of the total urbanized population, as estimated by the California Department of Finance. Historically, TAMC has programmed three years’ worth of Fair Share funding for a total of $3.6 million. The following table shows the Fair Share funding amounts for each of the cities and County for Fiscal Years 2013/14-15/16:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Total Population</th>
<th>Annual Allocation</th>
<th>3-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmel-by-the Sea</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>$10,747</td>
<td>$32,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>$4,692</td>
<td>$14,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>8,296</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>$23,619</td>
<td>$70,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>16,729</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>$47,628</td>
<td>$142,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City</td>
<td>13,073</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>$37,219</td>
<td>$111,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>20,073</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>$57,148</td>
<td>$171,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>28,252</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>$80,434</td>
<td>$241,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>15,268</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>$43,468</td>
<td>$130,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>153,215</td>
<td>36.35%</td>
<td>$436,205</td>
<td>$1,308,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand City</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>$962</td>
<td>$2,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>33,312</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>$94,840</td>
<td>$284,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>25,430</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>$72,400</td>
<td>$217,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Monterey</td>
<td>102,085</td>
<td>24.22%</td>
<td>$290,638</td>
<td>$871,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>421,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population: January 1, 2013 Department of Finance

Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC): Transportation for Livable Communities program aimed to encourage land use decisions that supported transit and reduced regional traffic congestion. This program rewarded jurisdictions that approved new housing and mixed-use development in urban locations near transit hubs. As of 2013, the program has been suspended as the goals of the TLC program are being met with the Complete Streets program.
RSTP Competitive Grants: RSTP Competitive Grants are an approved TAMC policy that apportions part of the RSTP funding on a competitive basis. The competitive amount varies from year to year based on the annual apportionment of RSTP funds. TAMC has distributed this competitive funding every two to three years. The distribution of competitive funds is based on a project scoring criteria, peer review and approved by the Board of Directors.

Projects must be consistent with a local transportation plan or general plan and be completed within three years of receiving funds. Application materials and scoring criteria are included in Appendix B.

Once funds are programmed to projects by the TAMC Board of Directors, the grantee may submit a claim for payment according to the procedures outlined in Appendix C.

Regional Surface Transportation Grant Procedures
The Transportation Agency for Monterey County staff will advise prospective claimants (eligible entities: cities, County, and Monterey-Salinas Transit) of the funds anticipated to be available, and of the procedures for applying for Regional Surface Transportation Program grant-awarded funds. Transportation Agency staff will adhere to the following procedures when administering the RSTP Competitive Grant program; however the Transportation Agency Board may elect to opt-out of a Competitive Grant cycle and program the RSTP funds towards projects of regional significance, foregoing this process.

- To be considered for funding, a grant application must be received by TAMC by the deadline specified in the call for projects.
- TAMC’s Technical Advisory Committee will appoint a Subcommittee, generally comprised of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee (BPC) members, partner agency staff, and Transportation Agency staff without a conflict of interest, to evaluate and rank all applications according to the “Criteria” listed in these policies. Subcommittee members will make their recommendations for projects to receive funding to the TAC.
- The TAC and BPC will consider approving the initial rankings recommended by the Subcommittee. The BPC will forward their recommendations on to the TAC for consideration. If the BPC’s comments cannot be incorporated, differences in recommendations will be discussed with the TAMC Board.
- The TAC will recommend approval for funding by the Transportation Agency Board. Alternative projects may also be listed in case recommended projects fail to be constructed.
- The Transportation Agency Board will consider the recommendations made by the TAC and the BPC. The Transportation Agency Board will vote to approve projects for funding by adopting a resolution.
- Transportation Agency staff will notify the agencies of those applications that have been funded.
Project Programming and Delivery
Projects using RSTP funds are not required to have a local match like federal transportation programs. Once funds are allocated to an approved project, the project sponsor has three years to expend the funds. Funds are paid to projects on a reimbursement basis and upon claim by the project sponsor to TAMC.

Programming Policies
The cities and County may program funds to eligible transportation projects within their Fair Share amounts apportioned by TAMC. With Transportation Agency Board approval, Fair Share funds can be deleted from one project and added to another project at the discretion of the project sponsor by submitting a written request to the Transportation Agency, provided that the change does not cause an over programming of total Fair Share available to the city or County. Fair Share funds provide the most amount of flexibility for the cities and County to move funds between projects.

Moving funds from the competitive or Transportation for Livable Communities categories is not allowed. If a project is not built or the project sponsor decides not to build the project, the funds revert back to the pool of funding for the next round of programming. If a city or County was awarded funding for two projects under the competitive category, the city or County may submit a written request for Transportation Agency Board approval to adjust funds between the two projects provided the total amount remains the same.

Local Jurisdictions Responsibility in RSTP Project Implementation
Once a project has been recommended and approved for RSTP funding then the local jurisdiction will need to implement the project in a timely manner.

Timely Use of Funds: California State Assembly Bill 1012 (AB102) requires that RSTP funds are subject to a “timely use of funds” provision. AB102 requires that once funds are obligated towards a project then the jurisdiction has up to three years to use the funds or lose them. The TAMC Board also has implemented a timely “Use of Funds Provision” that is similar to AB1012. The TAMC Timely Use of Funds provision gives the agency staff authority to de-obligate funds from a local agency if project implementation is not moving forward in a satisfactory manner and reapply these funds towards a project that is ready for implementation. This process of fund redistribution would first require the approval by the TAMC Board of Directors.

Annual Reporting: Recipients of RSTP funding will be required to submit an annual report to TAMC describing the use of funds. This report will provide interagency coordination to better assist in timely project implementation.

Project Completion Report: Recipients of RSTP funding will be required to submit a Project Completion Report, which includes before and after photos of the project, within sixty (60) days of the project being accepted as complete by the sponsor.
Media: Any press releases or media events held by the project sponsor to promote a RSTP funded project will include mention of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s role in funding the project.
APPENDIX A

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

23 USC § 133 - Surface transportation program
(b) Eligible Projects.— A State may obligate funds apportioned to it under section 104 (b)(2) for the surface transportation program only for the following:

1. Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, preservation, or operational improvements for highways, including construction of designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads under section 14501 of title 40.

2. Replacement (including replacement with fill material), rehabilitation, preservation, protection (including painting, scour countermeasures, seismic retrofits, impact protection measures, security countermeasures, and protection against extreme events) and application of calcium magnesium acetate, sodium acetate/formate, or other environmentally acceptable, minimally corrosive anti-icing and deicing compositions for bridges (and approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels on public roads of all functional classifications, including any such construction or reconstruction necessary to accommodate other transportation modes.

3. Construction of a new bridge or tunnel at a new location on a Federal-aid highway.

4. Inspection and evaluation of bridges and tunnels and training of bridge and tunnel inspectors (as defined in section 144), and inspection and evaluation of other highway assets (including signs, retaining walls, and drainage structures).

5. Capital costs for transit projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, including vehicles and facilities, whether publicly or privately owned, that are used to provide intercity passenger service by bus.

6. Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, including electric vehicle and natural gas vehicle infrastructure in accordance with section 137, bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways in accordance with section 217, and the modifications of public sidewalks to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

7. Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, installation of safety barriers and nets on bridges, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife, and railway-highway grade crossings.

8. Highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs.

9. Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs, including advanced truck stop electrification systems.

10. Surface transportation planning programs.

11. Transportation alternatives.

12. Transportation control measures listed in section 108 (f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi)) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408 (f)(1)(A)).
(13) Development and establishment of management systems [1]

(14) Environmental mitigation efforts relating to projects funded under this title in the same manner and to the same extent as such activities are eligible under section 119 (g).

(15) Projects relating to intersections that—
(A) have disproportionately high accident rates;
(B) have high levels of congestion, as evidenced by—
   (i) interrupted traffic flow at the intersection; and
   (ii) a level of service rating that is not better than “F” during peak travel hours, calculated in accordance with the Highway Capacity Manual issued by the Transportation Research Board; and
(C) are located on a Federal-aid highway.

(16) Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements.

(17) Environmental restoration and pollution abatement in accordance with section 328.

(18) Control of noxious weeds and aquatic noxious weeds and establishment of native species in accordance with section 329.

(19) Projects and strategies designed to support congestion pricing, including electric toll collection and travel demand management strategies and programs.

(20) Recreational trails projects eligible for funding under section 206.

(21) Construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities eligible for funding under section 129 (c).

(22) Border infrastructure projects eligible for funding under section 1303 of the SAFETEA–LU (23 U.S.C. 101 note; Public Law 109–59).

(23) Truck parking facilities eligible for funding under section 1401 of the MAP–21.

(24) Development and implementation of a State asset management plan for the National Highway System in accordance with section 119, including data collection, maintenance, and integration and the costs associated with obtaining, updating, and licensing software and equipment required for risk based asset management and performance based management, and for similar activities related to the development and implementation of a performance based management program for other public roads.

(25) A project that, if located within the boundaries of a port terminal, includes only such surface transportation infrastructure modifications as are necessary to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of the port.

(26) Construction and operational improvements for any minor collector if—
   (A) the minor collector, and the project to be carried out with respect to the minor collector, are in the same corridor as, and in proximity to, a Federal-aid highway designated as part of the National Highway System;
   (B) the construction or improvements will enhance the level of service on the Federal-aid highway described in subparagraph (A) and improve regional traffic flow; and
(C) the construction or improvements are more cost-effective, as determined by a benefit-cost analysis, than an improvement to the Federal-aid highway described in subparagraph (A).

(c) Location of Projects.—Surface transportation program projects may not be undertaken on roads functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors unless the roads were on a Federal-aid highway system on January 1, 1991, except—

(1) as provided in subsection (g);
(2) for projects described in paragraphs (2), (4), (6), (7), (11), (20), (25), and (26) of subsection (b); and
(3) as approved by the Secretary.

California Constitution - Article 19 Motor Vehicle Revenues
SEC. 2. Revenues from taxes imposed by the State on motor vehicle fuels for use in motor vehicles upon public streets and highways, over and above the costs of collection and any refunds authorized by law, shall be deposited into the Highway Users Tax Account (Section 2100 of the Streets and Highways Code) or its successor, which is hereby declared to be a trust fund, and shall be allocated monthly in accordance with Section 4, and shall be used solely for the following purposes:

(a) The research, planning, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of public streets and highways (and their related public facilities for non-motorized traffic), including the mitigation of their environmental effects, the payment for property taken or damaged for such purposes, and the administrative costs necessarily incurred in the foregoing purposes.

(b) The research, planning, construction, and improvement of exclusive public mass transit guideways (and their related fixed facilities), including the mitigation of their environmental effects, the payment for property taken or damaged for such purposes, the administrative costs necessarily incurred in the foregoing purposes, and the maintenance of the structures and the immediate right-of-way for the public mass transit guideways, but excluding the maintenance and operating costs for mass transit power systems and mass transit passenger facilities, vehicles, equipment, and services.
APPENDIX B

REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM COMPETITIVE FUNDING APPLICATION FORM
Grant Application Materials

Regional Surface Transportation Program Competitive Grants & Transportation Development Act 2%

Applications due: April 3, 2014 – 12:00 PM

Transportation Agency for Monterey County
55B Plaza Circle
Salinas, California 93901
Purpose & Principles

The Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) was established by California State Statute utilizing Surface Transportation Program Funds that are identified in Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code. The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) distributes these funds to local agencies as part of its responsibilities as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Monterey County.

The purpose of the program is to provide funding to local jurisdictions for a wide variety of transportation planning and improvement projects, such as the research, planning, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of public streets and highways (and their related public facilities for non-motorized traffic), including the mitigation of their environmental effects. A full listing of eligible projects can be found in the Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s Guidelines & Policies for the Administration of Regional Surface Transportation Program Funds.

In establishing the Regional Surface Transportation Program Competitive Grants program, the Transportation Agency is seeking to fund projects that advance the goals of the Transportation Agency Board. These include funding and delivering projects of regional significance that improve safety, provide maintenance for existing facilities, or support the development of a multimodal transportation network utilizing the principles of Complete Streets. Fair geographic balance in distributing the funds and the cost effectiveness of the proposed projects in meeting the program’s goals are also taken into consideration when awarding grant funds.

Instructions

(1) You must complete an application form for each project. All projects must submit an application, even if it has previously applied and received RSTP funding.

(2) If your agency submits more than one project application, you must identify your highest priority project.

(3) You are responsible for completing all sections of the application form and attaching any relevant information. Your project application will only be scored based on the information that is provided in your application. Additional information will not be accepted after the deadline; however, it may be presented to the TAMC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review.

(4) Your project must pass the “Screening Criteria” section of this application form in order to qualify for funding.

(5) You should refer to the attached RSTP Scoring Criteria when preparing the “Project Information” section of your application. You are responsible for providing complete and accurate information in order to receive the highest points possible.

(6) The deadline for applications is the first Thursday in April by 12:00 PM. All applications must be received by TAMC on this date. No postmarks or faxes will be accepted. No application forms or additional information will be accepted after this date.

(7) For each application submitted, you must include three paper copies and a PDF copy.
Screening Criteria
In order to qualify for RSTP funding, your project must meet the following criteria:

A. Your project must be implemented within a 3-year timeframe. Please specify if your project will meet this deadline. Please note that after three years, your project will lose the funding if it has not yet been completed.

B. Your project must be consistent with a minimum of one of the local or regional plans listed below. Please check off the applicable plans:

   Local General Plan   _____
   Capital Improvement Program (CIP)   _____
   Pavement Management System (PMS)   _____
   Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP)   _____
   MST Service Improvement Plan   _____
   Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)   _____
   Approved Transportation Impact Study   _____
   Other (please specify)   _____

C. For intersection projects, the California Department of Transportation Intersection Control Evaluation (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/liasons/ice.html) must be completed or a commitment to completing the evaluation prior to receiving RSTP funds.
Section A: Project Information & Regional Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Sponsor / Lead Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Contact Information (address, phone, email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Amount of RSTP Funds Requested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identify the funding sources for the project. You must specify if these funding sources are secured or proposed. Also indicate fiscal years in which these funds are programmed. Attached additional information if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description (include Average Daily Traffic data – vehicle, bike & ped, or transit passengers)

Is there a history of collisions in the project area (pedestrian, bicycle, motorist)?

Project Benefits (attach additional information if needed)

Describe how your project links regional origin / destinations or serves regional travel

Scoring Categories

A1) Traffic volume  
1 point = 1 - 5,000 ADT  
5 points = 5,001 - 10,000 ADT  
7 points = 10,001 - 20,000 ADT  
10 points = 20,001+ ADT

A2) Regional Significance  
The application will receive 1-15 points based on how well the project serves travelers from other areas or more than one jurisdiction.

A3) Does the project address an area with a history of collisions?  
5 points

Subtotal (max.) 25
Section B: Complete Streets

Complete the attached Complete Streets Checklist and include with your application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1) Project increases non-motorized demand</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2) Stakeholder outreach was conducted on the project scope and design</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3) Pedestrian facilities are improved with the project</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4) Bicycle facilities are improved with the project</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5) Transit facilities are improved with the project</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (max.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exemptions: Based on the project’s completed Complete Streets Checklist for the project’s street design type, the project warrants the following exemptions from Section B scoring categories:

B1) Project increases non-motorized demand
B2) Stakeholder outreach was conducted on the project scope and design
B3) Pedestrian facilities are improved with the project
B4) Bicycle facilities are improved with the project
B5) Transit facilities are improved with the project

Explanation for exemptions:
### CHECKLIST - Existing Conditions

#### 4. Existing Land Uses (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/Public Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor-Serving/Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Safety (See Complete Streets Needs Assessment Matrix & http://tims.berkeley.edu/)

- Are there perceived safety/speeding issues in the project area?  
  - Yes  
  - No

- Is there a history of collisions in the project area?  
  - Pedestrian  
  - Bicyclist  
  - Motorist

#### 6. Congestion

- Does the roadway experience congestion?  
  - Yes  
  - No

- If so, at what time(s) is it congested?  
  - AM Peak  
  - PM Peak

#### 7. Existing Roadway Conditions/Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Width</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Pavement Width</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB/EB:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB/WB:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Center Turn lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Width</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping/Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lane Width (&lt;5’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Condition</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted Speed Limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volumes (AADT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Route/Stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHECKLIST - Future Conditions

8. Future Roadway Conditions

Are there planned transportation & land use projects that could affect circulation in the project area?  

Yes  No

If so, please list the project(s)

Are planned projects anticipated to increase travel demand in the area? (mark yes or no for each mode)

Car  Yes  No  Transit  Yes  No  Bicycle  Yes  No

9. Stakeholder Outreach (check all that apply)

Please indicate which stakeholder groups provided input on project scope and design:

Neighborhood Group  Business Association  School  Property Owners  Environmental Group

Bicycle Committees  Pedestrian Committee  Senior Group  Transit Agency  Transportation Disadvantaged

Specific changes requested by stakeholders?  Yes  No

10. Circle the Complete Street Design Type - (See Table 2 of Guidebook)

Street Design Type

Main Street  Avenue  Boulevard  Parkway

Local/Subdivision Street  Rural Road

Local  Collector  Arterial

Pedestrian/Bicycle-Oriented  Auto/Truck-Oriented
### 11. Transportation Network Deficiencies (Refer to Existing Conditions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficiency</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lacking/Insufficient Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking/Insufficient Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking/Insufficient Transit Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for seniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for students/youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the Existing and Future Conditions the project area is a candidate for:

- **Road Diet (3 or more lanes; AADT<20,000; bicycle collisions)**
- **Traffic Calming**
- **Roundabout**
- **Transit-Oriented Development/Transit Corridor (15 min headway)**
- **Neighborhood Shared Street**
- **Pedestrian Place**
- **Transit/Bicycle/Pedestrian Prioritization at Intersections**
CHECKLIST - Design

The purpose of this section is to ensure all users have been considered in the design of the project. Complete street design is context-sensitive and a complete street in a rural area may look different than one in an urban area. Refer to safety and special user needs identified in the existing and future conditions sections. The Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook Chapter 5 contains design best-practices and sample accommodations for these users.

12. Pedestrian Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize Driveways</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk/Path</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping/Parking Buffer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Access</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Treatments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audible Countdown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Bicycle Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared-Lane Markings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiuse Path</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route/Wayfinding Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Detection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Box</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color-Treated Bike</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 14. Transit Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Bus Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Bulbs/Pull-Outs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time Bus Arrival Info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS/Signal Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service (15 min headways)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi-Fi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop/Station Amenities*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transit Amenities include: Bench, lighting, trash can, route information/maps, concessions, music, and public art.
### CHECKLIST - Trade-Offs & Exemptions

#### 15. Project Trade-Offs

Is the recommended complete street cross section/design supportable?  
- Yes  
- No

If not, explain why:

- Lack of ROW width
- Existing Structures
- Trees/Environmental Features
- Insufficient Funding
- Other

Have alternative designs been considered?  
- Yes  
- No

What refinements to the cross section/needed were needed?

**Removed/partial zones (Ch. 5) for:**
- Pedestrians
- Bicyclists
- Landscaping
- Vehicles

**Considered alternative routes/locations for:**
- Pedestrians
- Bicyclists
- Landscaping
- Vehicles

#### 16. Exemptions (Refer to Ch. 6 of the Guidebook)

Is the project exempt from accommodating certain users?  
- Yes  
- No

Cost of accommodation is excessively disproportionate to the need or probably use?  
- Yes  
- No

Documented absence of current and future need?  
- Yes  
- No

Other
**Section C: Project Readiness & Cost Effectiveness**

What is the status of your project? Provide a schedule of when the project components (e.g. design, construction) will be started and completed. Attach supporting documentation and additional information as needed.

List all costs associated with the project. This money will be granted for a three-year time frame. Indicate whether matching funds are secured or unsecured.

Total RSTP funding request: $_________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>RSTP Funds</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Fund Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY14/15 FY15/16 FY16/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Document:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach and Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1) Project is ready to bid within one year</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2) Request for funding will fully fund the project</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3) Project has already started and has completed the following phase(s):</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points = Environmental Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points = Plans, Specifications, and Estimates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% complete = 1 point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% complete = 2 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% complete = 4 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% complete = 5 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal (max.)  25
Section D: Safety Improvements & Sustainability Features

Consistency with the goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan is a requirement for all projects applying for Regional Surface Transportation Program competitive grant funding. Please indicate below how your proposed project will help to achieve the program goals of safety and sustainability on a qualitative scale of low, medium, or high projected impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access &amp; Mobility</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve ability of Monterey County residents to meet most daily needs without having to drive. Improve the convenience and quality of trips, especially for walk, bike, transit, car/vanpool and freight.</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces passenger hours of delay</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces average peak period travel time</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety &amp; Health</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design, operate, and manage the transportation system to reduce serious injuries and fatalities, promote active living, and lessen exposure to pollution.</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces the number of fatalities and injuries due to collisions</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves bicycle, pedestrian, and transit mode share</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Stewardship</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect and enhance the County’s built and natural environment. Act to reduce the transportation system’s emission of Greenhouse Gasses.</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserves sensitive habitat or prime agriculture land</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce disparities in healthy, safe access to key destinations for transportation-disadvantaged populations.</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides funding for project serving Environmental Justice populations</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases the percent of population within 1/2 mile of high quality transit stop</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Benefit</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invest in transportation improvements – including operational improvements – that reinvest in Monterey County economy, improve economic access and improve travel time reliability and speed consistency for high-value trips.</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces vehicle hours of delay</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces the number of distressed lane miles</td>
<td>Low Medium High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring Categories

#### 1) Project demonstrates an improvement in the safety and mobility of the facility

1-5 points = Safety Improvements

1-5 points = Access & Mobility Improvements

#### 2) Project includes features that promote social, environmental, and economic goals

1-5 points = Social Equity

1-5 points = Economic Benefits

1-5 points = Environmental Stewardship

**Subtotal (max.)** 25
APPENDIX C

REIMBURSEMENT FORM
**TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR**  
**MONTEREY COUNTY (TAMC)**  
**CLAIM FOR PAYMENT**  
55-B Plaza Circle  
Salinas, CA 93901-2902  
831-775-0903 Tel  
831-775-0897 FAX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Address of Claimant</th>
<th>Dept.’s Control No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim For</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>From Fund:</th>
<th>Check one to indicate use of funds:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Street and Road Purposes
- Public Transit - Operating
- Public Transit - Capital
- 2% Bicycle and Pedestrian Account Purposes
- Other :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Project or Purposes of Expenditures:</th>
<th>Expended to date on this project:</th>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less amount claimed to date on this project:</th>
<th>Amount of this claim:</th>
<th>TOTAL CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Handling Instructions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIGNATURE OF CLAIMANT**  
I certify that this claim is in accordance with provisions Of the Transportation Development Act:

Signature, title of claimant

**APPROVAL OF DEPARTMENT**  
This claim is based on TAMC approved application and there are adequate funds available in claimant’s account:

TAMC Executive Director

Approved as stated hereon:

TAMC Administrative Services Manager

**APPROVAL OF AUDITOR**  
I certify that I have received all required documents for this claim and that the computations on the documentation and Claim are correct. This claim is approved for payment:

Mike Miller, AUDITOR – CONTROLLER, By Deputy Auditor
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee
From: Ariana Green, Transportation Planner
Meeting Date: January 8, 2013
Subject: Marina-Salinas Multimodal Corridor Plan Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

RECEIVE update on the Marina-Salinas Multimodal Corridor Conceptual Plan.

SUMMARY:
This project will plan for a multimodal corridor that will connect the Monterey Peninsula to Salinas. Transportation Agency staff will work with partner agencies and members of the public to develop the plan.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The budgeted funding for the entire scope of work is $232,798. A Caltrans Community-Based Transportation Planning Grant is contributing $200,000 and the remaining $32,798 through a local match.

DISCUSSION:
This project will plan for a transit, bicycle, pedestrian and auto corridor which will connect Marina to Salinas. The plan will also look at improving connections to transportation projects and activity centers within the study area such as the Monterey Branch Line light rail, CSUMB, Hartnell College, County Government Center, Salinas Transit Center and Salinas train station. The final product, a conceptual plan for the multimodal transportation corridor will be a guiding document for development and roadway designs, and serve as a tool to raise money for project implementation. In August 2013 the Transportation Agency Board approved a contract with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. to develop the Marina-Salinas Multimodal Corridor Plan.

The first part of the planning process will focus on determining a preferred corridor route which will then be adopted by partner agencies. The second part of the planning process will identify preferred conceptual roadway design features along the agreed upon corridor route. Some
features that may be considered are bicycle facilities, sidewalks or paths, transit stops/shelters, transit prioritization at signalized intersections, dedicated bus rapid transit facilities and pedestrian and equestrian crossing enhancements.

Since this item was presented to the TAMC board in September 2013, TAMC staff has begun outreach to interest groups, city councils, commissions and boards. To date staff has presented to and received input from the following groups:

- Farm Bureau
- Grower-Shipper Association
- Monterey County Hospitality Association
- Salinas Chamber of Commerce
- TAMC Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
- TAMC Technical Advisory Committee
- Monterey County Fort Ord Subcommittee
- Monterey County Planning Commission
- Salinas City Council
- Marina City Council

Presentations to the Monterey-Salinas Transit Board, the cycling community and environmental interest groups have been scheduled for January and February 2014.

To engage members of the general public, staff will facilitate two rounds of community workshops, one for each phase of the project. The first round of community workshops, focused on the potential corridor alignments, will be held in Salinas and at CSUMB in late January or early February. More information about the workshops will be posted on the Marina-Salinas Multimodal Corridor Plan webpage on the TAMC website.

In addition to engaging decision-makers and interest groups, TAMC has also been working with a group of staff-level representatives from each of the land-governing jurisdictions or “partner agencies”. The partner agency group has met twice thus far to discuss potential alignments for the corridor, existing plans and policy and opportunities and constraints. The group will meet again in early February to develop a recommendation for a preferred corridor alignment which will be presented to partner agency boards and councils in February and March 2014.

Kimley-Horn and Associates is currently conducting a constraints and opportunities analysis of potential corridor segments. The results of this analysis will be presented to all partner agency boards and councils in February and March 2014 and to the TAMC board in March 2014. At this time, staff will also present the public input received including a recommendation for a preferred corridor alignment.

Approved by: [Signature]
Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Date signed: 12-16-13

Regular Agenda

Agency Counsel Review: N/A
Admin/Finance Approval: N/A